UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)
)
V.) Cr. No. 03-10364-RWZ
)
KENNETH WAGNER)

KENNETH WAGNER'S REPLY TO GOVERNMENT'S OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION IN LIMINE

Now Comes, defendant, Kenneth Wagner, who respectfully replies to the Government's Opposition to Defendant's Motion In Limine as follows. The government opposes defendant's Motion In Limine to keep out his medical records on the grounds that they are indeed relevant, are not unfairly prejudicial and are authenticated by conditions subsequent. Defendant shall respond to the first two issues raised by the government in three sections below:

1. Relevancy of the Treatment Records as a Whole

The government suggests that the medical records are relevant as they will shed light on whether the defendant knew he was being treated for depression, anxiety or suicide attempts. These records in no way demonstrate that Mr. Wagner was in fact aware that he was receiving treatment for those conditions or any other "mental disorder" as described in Section 18 of the Medical Certificate. See 9/05/01 Medical Certificate attached as Exhibit A.

While the medical records apparently indicate that his treating physician concluded that Mr. Wagner was suffering from depression, these records do not indicate that this information was in fact conveyed to Mr. Wagner prior to or on 9/5/01.

Therefore, these medical records cannot be probative of Mr. Wagner's knowledge when he allegedly made the false statement by checking "no" in box 18 of the "Medical Certificate." Exhibit A.

The government's also argues that, because defense counsel has signaled that he will seek to introduce Mr. Wagner's personnel file in to evidence, his medical treatment records are, therefore, also relevant. The tail may be wagging the dog in this argument as defendant is seeking to introduce these records primarily because the government will try to introduce Wagner's medical records. Given the substantial and unfair prejudice that will follow from the introduction of these medical records, defendant will need to offset this prejudice by demonstrating to the jury that Mr. Wagner is in fact a competent flight controller without any incidents. Otherwise the jury will convict him merely because their emotions have been inflamed by the descriptions written in these records. This would clearly be a violation of Mr. Wagner's right to a fair trial pursuant to the Fifth Amendment of the United States Constitution.

¹Defendant would be seeking to introduce the entire personnel record for the purpose of completeness. Counsel is more than willing to redact the portion of the record relating to

Evidence is unfairly prejudicial when it has "an undue tendency to suggest decision on an improper basis, commonly, though not necessarily, an emotional one." Advisory Committee's Note Rule 403. "Unfairly prejudicial evidence is evidence having some quality that moves the jury to attribute to it excessive probative value. It is evidence that 'triggers [the] mainsprings of human action [in such a way as to] cause a jury to base its decision on something other than the established proposition in the case.'" United States v. Currier, 836 F.2d 11,, 18 (1st Cir. 1987) If the medical treatment records are admitted into evidence they will create an improper inference for the jury that Mr. Wagner was aware of the diagnoses or descriptions contained in these records at the time that he allegedly filled out the Medical Certificate on 9/5/01. Such an inference would be improper and, therefore, providing the jury with these records would be unfair prejudicial to Mr. Wagner in violation of Mr. Wagner's Fifth Amendment right to a fair trial.

2. Portions of the Records Are Unfairly Prejudicial

If, arguendo, this Court were to deny defense request to exclude the medical records altogether, counsel has marked portions of the records in brackets as being unfairly prejudicial. In particular, and without waiving defendant's

his insurance that was identified by the government or other pages that are not relevant. Also, it should be noted that the introduction of personnel records would not adequately offset the unfair prejudice caused by introduction of the medical records by the government.

previous arguments, defendant refers the Court to the July 3, 2000 records for the most poinant example. On that day Dr. Weiner wrote a number of words corresponding to either symptoms experienced by Mr. Wagner (or possibly his family members) or subjective observations by the doctor himself that were apparently based upon other statements or conduct by Mr. Wagner or his family. The records do not elaborate or make a distinction as to how Dr. Weiner came to these conclusions or observations.

So assuming that Mr. Wagner did not testify, defendant submits that these writings by Dr. Weiner are not probative of whether Mr. Wagner understood he was diagnosed with a mental disorder. If he does testify, however, defendant submits that this portion (and others mentioned in his earlier motion) of the records are still unfairly prejudicial.

While the government can certainly ask whether Mr. Wagner knew or was told on or prior to 9/5/01 that he was diagnosed or being treated for depression, anxiety or some other mental disorder, these records have no value either for impeachment purposes or as affirmative evidence of the central issue before the court; i.e. whether Mr. Wagner falsified this document.² If

²The government suggests, for example, that Dr. Weiner's alleged statement that Mr. Wagner was having suicidal thoughts at some point in the past should be brought out to assist the jury in finding that he failed to answer that the box asking if he had ever attempted suicide. Suicidal thoughts do not convert to

the jury hears this evidence, they will be so prejudiced against Mr. Wagner that they jury "will base its decision on something other than the established proposition in the case." Id.3

3. Relevancy of Sections of Treatment Records

If this Court were to find that the records were probative aspect of the government's case, then defendant has outlined in his original motion the areas that he believes lack probative value. Many, if not most, of the requested redactions involve treatment records created after Mr. Wagner filled out the Medical Certification in guestion.⁴

The government has responded that it needs to introduce these treatment records because they will rebut defense claims that he was not dangerous and was in fact a competent controller? Why would post 9/5/01 such records be admissible to rebut a

attempting suicide. It also does not convert into a finding that Mr. Wagner knew he was being treated for a mental disorder based upon these alleged thoughts.

³The government suggests that its speculative to suggest that the jury will ignore the Court's instructions to be fair and impartial. The government misses the point that Rule 403 was designed exactly with that concern in mind; that certain evidence can inflame a jury and cause them to ignore the probative evidence. See Advisory Committees' Note, Rule 403, <u>supra</u>. Such evidence must be excluded to avoid denying a defendant his due process right to a fair trial. See Fifth Amendment to United states Constitution.

⁴While there may be other records that fall into this post 9/5/01 time period that are not probative of whether Mr. Wagner falsified his Medical Certification, defendant is not clairvoyant and cannot specify those at present time that he would object to at trial.

defense contention that Mr. Wagner was a good controller. Only his record and his fellow controllers can speak to his skill and ability as a flight controller. The treatment records are subjective diagnoses by a physician that have no relevance to whether he was indeed performing his job. The only reason that the government would seek to introduce such records would be to create an improper inference that he was mentally unstable and therefore a danger to people who fly out of Logan.

Additionally, these post 9/5/01 records have absolutely no relevance to whether he falsified his Medical Certification.

While the actual act of supplying records in 2003 to the FAA is certainly relevant, the content of the records created post 9/5/01 is not to his state of mind on the day he filled out the Medical Certification.

Wherefore defendant moves this Court to grant his Motion in whole or in part.

Respectfully submitted, BY HIS ATTORNEY,

JAMES/H. BUDREAU, BAR#553391

20 Park Plaza, Suite 905

Boston, MA 02116

(617) 227-3700

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing document was served by hand on the 5th day of August, 2004 to Assistant U.S. Nadine Pellegrini.

James H. Budreau

Appli Int Must Con	hplete ALLY emist.	_cept For S	Haded Areas	SUPER E	MALL	्राकृति Approved QMB NO. 2120-0
			mer Meteratorie & A	Writter West Cal and Judent Pilot Certificate	Class of Me	Sale of Processing States of the sales
ी । जिल्लाहरू स्टब्स्ट स्टब्स		A-Lest H	LAGRICA MEN			Middle Nario
		Cśśżai	Security Number		_ 70 PE	1 HERO, 1800; (P.V. 40
		HANGS HE	CS LUWN		lephone Number (50	8 748 283.29
		Number/S		_	CC/1.54	28 Mouth and Dyoan
		DBI tage!		(CF : HEAT PARTY CO.)	Se your manage was	THE PARTY OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PARTY OF TH
	Rudul Probatics	A. Pete Q		6 1962	7. Color of lake	8 Color of Eyes 9 Se
		di Citizer	USA		BLACK	HASHMOME
	Charles of the State of the Sta	χης ιουμ Ω ΓηΝ	of Airman Certificat	4.	ind. Un in mississi n and stated	ctor Circleational
F		N E E A	rline Transport El	I Flight Engineer™	Private **	Thirties we
		0400000	nomercial	Flight Navigator	Student	View Powers every
MANUFACTURE CO	XBBCRIVA CARRE	i A	TC 5	+	FAA	
			our FAA Airman Me		ves nive date	pended, or Revoked ?
100		Total Pik	ot Time (Civilian Only)		M M	/ D D / Y Y Y Y t FAA Medical Application
PERSONAL CONTRACTOR	Consideration of the constraint of the constrain	14. To Da	V/A	5. Past 6 months	09 1L	1999 No Prior
50/451		17.a. Do)	ou Currently Use A	uny Medication (Preso w list medication(s) use	dodon or Monney	e-following -
Supplemental Control	er transport	2 0000	OCC: OX		A SECTION AND ADDRESS.	ON COMPYMENTS
			01 0V	19 (980		Here L And 9 (1)
ARREST SIGNATURE	Consider to the second			Of more space is requi	red, ste 17, a, on the	nstruction sheet).
18. Medical History FHAVE YO	LEVER IN YOUR LIFE REEN DAG	MOCED WATER DAT	OP DO VOU DOC	VISION CONTACT LENSING	OF THE FOLLOWIN	(2) Answer yes or no
72 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10		and there has been	PREVIOUSLY REP	ORTED NO CHANG Indition & See Instru		pation of the condition was
- [2] [A Empress Of several basels	chee GE Stead or years	fillion	Yes No This	Coloition Colors of Mry sort	Yes No	Condition blein 23
▶ Dizziness or fainting spell	h. [] K High or low bloc	d pressure	AND MAKES	regardence di called 100 di scriptance abus 100 substance in the	,	a rejection by military service
e.□ Ix Unconsciousness for any		-C 2598358 3800000 20200		legal substance in the	L □ K Rejec	tion for life or health histogram
d.□ ⊠ Eye or vision trouble exce a.□ ☑ Hay fever or allergy		blood in urine	a. □ Malgohol de	pendence or abuse	and the second second second second	sion to bospital and the
Asthma or lung disease			Suicide at			illness, disability, or surgery
A CONTROL OF THE PROPERTY OF T	raffve Action History See U	A 1 TO 1 T	A Lipid Motion sid	kness requiring medica	tion	or a company of the contract o
Yes No History of (1) arry con	viction(s) involving driving while	intoxicated by	mile impaired by	Or while under the	Yes No w. □ 24 Hist	alite or sand language
offense(s) which resu	viction(s) involving driving white ir a drug; or (2) history of any lited in the denial, suspension Readers at an educational or a m	conviction(s) or a cancellation, or	idministrative action revocation of dri	on(s) involving an	[con	ory of nontraffic viction(s)
Explanations: See instruction		ehabilitation progr	ram.		(mis	demeànors or felonies).
W/a	% *	,			•	FOR FAA USE
				-		
A Property of the second						
19. Visits to Health Profession	onal Within Last 3 Years.	Yes	(Explain Below)	no 📜 🗷 No	. See Instruction	ons Page
, paine, A	ddress, and Type of Health P	rofessional Con	Sulted	44 69 1	Reason	
			en energia		१५४ १५७७	<u> </u>
- NOTICE -	20	Anniinanii Mai	and the second s	4 7 7 7 7 7 7	Carrier and Carrier Control	A CONTRACTOR OF THE PROPERTY O
Whoever in any matter within the unissistion of any department or agency of the United States				ster and Certifying		lumish to the FAA
knowingly and willfully falsifies, conceals or covers up by any mice.	verify information provided in this	annication: Unon m	in want pe Evv	ntzatjón for a single ac hall make the informati	cess to the informati on received from the	on contained in the NDR to NDR, if any, available for
scheme, or device a material fact or who makes any false, actitions	NOTE: ALL persons usin	ng this form must a	ign It. NDR consen	t; however, does not	apply unless this f	orm is used as an
or fraudulent statements or representations, or entry, may be	thereby certify that all statements	and answers provid	ed ply we on this abt	lication form are comp	ertificate.; lete and true to the !	best of my knowledge, and I
fined up to \$250,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years onboth	o ctatel hent that accomplantes this for Signature of Applicant	Offi	DOTAN 02740	AA certificate to the 1	have also read and	Understand the Privacy Act
78 U.S. Code Secs: 1001; 3571).			Application of the second seco			ate 09/65/260 /
FAA Form 8500-8 (3-99) Superse	des Previous Edition	\bigcirc		THE RELEASE CO. L.	at a second	NSN: 0052-00-670-600